

2-19-2008

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, Feb. 19, 2008

Arts & Sciences Faculty

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, Feb. 19, 2008" (2008). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 54.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/54](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/54)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Approved Minutes  
Special Meeting  
Arts and Sciences Faculty  
Tuesday, February 19, 2008**

Members Present: **February 19, 2008**  
**Faculty Meeting**

Attendance: Vidhu Aggarwal, Barry Allen, Ilan Alon, Benny Balak, Gabriel Barreneche, Pedro Bernal, Gay Biery-Hamilton, Erich Blossey, Alexander Boguslawski, Rick Bommelijs, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Sharon Carnahan, Julie Carrington, Roger Casey, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Julian Chambliss, David Charles, Martha Cheng, Doug Child, Ed Cohen, Gloria Cook, Tom Cook, Daniel Crozier, Denise Cummings, Mario D'Amato, Creston Davis, Don Davison, Kimberly Dennis, Rossana Diaz-Zambrana, Lewis Duncan, James Eck, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Marc Fetscherin, Richard Foglesong, Elise Friedland, Greg Gardner, Laurel Goj, Elton Graugnard, Yudit Greenburg, Eileen Gregory, Don Griffin, Mike Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Fiona Harper, Paul Harris, Scott Hewit, John Houston, Gordie Howell, Richard James, Yvonne Jones, Laurie Joyner, Steve Klemann, Madeline Kovarik, Philip Kozel, Harry Kypraios, Susan Lackman, Tom Lairson, Carol Lauer, Ed Leroy, Barry Levis, Susan Libby, Lee Lines, Edna McClellan, Cecilia McInnis-Bowers, Margaret McLaren, Matilde Mesavage, Jonathan Miller, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgrave, Steve Neilson, Rachel Newcomb, Marvin Newman, Kathryn Norsworthy, Socky O'Sullivan, Rhonda Ovist, Ceren Ozelcuk, Twila Papay, Alberto Prieto-Calixto, Jennifer Queen, Roger Ray, David Richard, Charlie Rock, Maria Ruiz, Emily Russell, Marc Sardy, Eric Schutz, Rachel Simmons, John Sinclair, Bob Smither, Paul Stephenson, Bruce Stephenson, Darren Stoub, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitasky, Ken Taylor, Mary Throumoulos, Lisa Tillmann, Patricia Tome, Rick Vitray, Anca Voicu, Debra Wellman, Yusheng Yao, Wenxian Zhang, Eric Zivot

Guest: Sharon Agee

- I. Call to Order – Davison called the meeting to order at 12:37 PM.
- II. Announcements – Davison announced that because of this was a special meeting of the faculty that he will rule out of-order any amendment not germane to the merit plan. Also he asked that any amendments be presented to the secretary in writing so that there will be no confusion. Also he will limit each speaker to three minutes so that everyone has a fair opportunity to speak. He also thanked the members of the Task Force—Ryan Musgrave, Dick James, Bob Smither, Kathryn Norsworthy, Susan Libby, and David Charles—for their thorough work in a very short period of time.

### III. New Business

Merit Compensation System – Vitray moved the following: *“The faculty directs the Executive Committee to initiate the development of a merit plan and bring the plan to the faculty for consideration by the end of this academic year.”* Griffin seconded the motion. Vitray felt that the merit system would break down the egalitarian approach, which he felt had already experienced cracks. The system we have now also causes problems in hiring in certain disciplines. Child asked what would happen if a faculty committee could not come up with a good plan in such a short period of time. Davison said that if either a plan is not developed or the faculty rejects the proposal that the status quo would resume. Rock asked if there was any commitment from the Board of Trustees or the administration that the material resources are available to bring the faculty up to the compensation levels of peer institutions. Duncan said that the email that he sent out responded to that. (See addendum 1) The Trustees are committed to recruit, reward, and maintain a high quality faculty. This is its goal, but not the plan to get there. Merit pay is one of the aspects of that path. The Board would not be supportive of a plan to increase level of salaries of the peer group before merit plan must be put in place first. Tillman stated that she was not opposed to a plan for merit pay, but she thought this motion was premature. The motion reads that, *“The faculty directs...”* but this was not a faculty-driven directive. This motion is premature. Merit pay is presented as a solution, but the faculty has not been presented with the problem it is supposed to solve. There has been no consultation on the part of the Trustees about what the problems are. We need a conversation first about the median level of compensation; do we want to have a variance in the salary structure within A&S? The Trustees have never presented data that merit pay will help us achieve our goals. With median salaries below peer institutions, a merit system would be demoralizing. Lauer agreed with Tillman and expressed concern about the size of the merit pool. She would like to see a minimum size of the salary pool to trigger the merit pay system. Newman felt that Lauer’s amendment would not be germane to the motion. Levis countered by suggesting that the main motion could be amended to define perimeters within which the task force could develop a merit system. Lauer moved to amend the motion that will provide a mechanism for a minimum merit pool threshold to be determined by the planning committee. Rock seconded. McInnis-Bowers opposed the amendment because she did not want to restrict the work of the task force at this time. Lines expressed concern that the faculty might add too many amendments. Lairson called the question. Davison called for a division of the house. The question was called by vote of 56 to 15. The amendment was defeated by a vote 24 to 48.

Kypraios argued that one of the major complaints that he had heard concerned the level of under compensation of the faculty. He understood from the president that imbedded in the pool will be some adjustments to bring faculty salaries up to where we should be. Will we ever catch up with the one million

dollar shortfall? The carrot of money to vote for merit is sufficient enough to vote for merit. He would like to see the money available this year to make adjustments and develop a merit system later. Newman felt his points were not germane to the motion. Davison ruled amendment out of order. Schutz did not think the merit plan being presented was satisfactory. He thought it should be a bonus system rather than permanent pay increase. He felt the Trustees were using coercion. You don't get a raise if you don't approve merit. We've gone without a merit pay system for the time he has been at Rollins, and we are now number one in the South. Do we have parity and equality? These considerations are separate from merit. Market is also a factor. We are being asked to accept a merit system to address all of these issues. Jones called the question asking that the motion be defeated. The motion to call the question was defeated by voice vote.

Carnahan thought that much of the perception is that the merit system would benefit only a few. While she favors a merit system, adjustments would not take place with the current administration. But any plan must reward the vast majority of the faculty who are clearly meritorious. Ovist thought that we are a long way from the tenor of the motion that this process has already been decided and that we will simply go through steps to think we are involved. She thought that this process will take a long time to reach what the task force showed was necessary to have a successful system, but the Board of Trustees is not giving us the time. She does not like the feeling of being threatened or bribed. She does not like the process or the rush. Stoub thought that the faculty seems to be most concerned that they will not have much of an input into the process. He recommended inserting "in consultation with the faculty." Vitray accepted his recommendation as a friendly amendment. Davison said that all along he expected the faculty would develop and administrate any merit plan. McLaren expressed concern about the amount of time left before some of the faculty had to leave for class. She did not want a vote after 1:45. She still did not see the convincing arguments in favor and against the motion. She considered the motion premature because the most convincing problem is the fact that our salaries are well below standards. We work in a sweatshop. This is the most divisive issue we have ever faced. It has demoralized the faculty. We need to address parity because we are working under minimum wage so to speak. All levels of the faculty want the parity issue addressed first. She moved to close debate by 1:45. The motion carried.

Boniface believed that we can design a good system and by voting for this motion we can take a leap of faith and design a good system. He was optimistic about what we can do. He is philosophically in favor of a merit plan but also saw the need to be concerned about egalitarianism. He conceded that the rationale for introducing a merit plan to Rollins was not made as strongly to the faculty as it would have been had it originated from the faculty as a whole rather than being "imposed" from the Board of Trustees. He expressed the view that it was desirable to have a Board that was willing to

raise our salaries without strings attached "just because" we have a great faculty earning uncompetitive salaries (when compared to peer and aspirant institutions). He concluded, however, that flaws in the decision-making process should not prevent the faculty from voting for the proposal. The process was not ideal, but it was "good enough." Duncan said that there would be a 4% increase in the traditional pool. We are talking about the additional amount requested by the Budget Committee that will be distributed on merit. The increase in tuition would be 5.75% that the Trustees will be happy to reduce if the faculty does not approve a merit plan. Norsworthy said she had worked on the task force and talked extensively with administrators who observed that structural change is a very separate issue from merit. She did not see connection to market at all. Because we do not have access to salary information, the merit model cannot address the structural problem, which needs to be addressed first. She thought it was demoralizing to the faculty to be in this shape without salaries at reasonable levels while discussing a merit system that will not address the structural piece. Richards thought that our situation far better than other institutions that he had experienced. He moved to add salary equity to the motion. Davison ruled the amendment out of order. Lairson thought it is a very simple question. Where else would you go to work where you would get a 4% increase and have a role in planning how to use the rest of the pool. If most of faculty were rated as meritorious then each would have a permanent increase of \$3000 to base salary this year. He thought the issue was a no brainer. Newcomb asked if the 7% increase will be available each year. Davison reported that the traditional pool will always be there. But the merit pool would depend on the financial circumstances of the college. O'Sullivan argued that this is the most vague motion the faculty has ever voted on. He had many concerns about the president's letter to the faculty. He worried that market issues will pit departments against each other. Full professors were the hardest hit last year by the creative economics that determined the salary increases. He thought that the total 7% in this year's pool should be used to address those inequities. Referring to data distributed by Rock, O'Sullivan noted that only the administrators seem to have kept up with the benchmark. Foglesong thought this was the most excellent dialogue he had experienced at a faculty meeting. He supports a merit plan. He saw an older nostalgic Rollins that would give up the money. There is also a new Rollins that is struggling to be born. We need to be willing to accept something new to move the institutions forward. He thought our system of compensation does not link to the institutional goals with regards to excellence. The current salary system causes resentment among the achievers for having the same salary increases as the underachievers. He saw this with serving on FEC where faculty who only produced two articles received the same rewards as someone who produced four. Graugnard asked if the faculty needed to vote yes at this time or lose the money. Smaw supported the motion and called the question, which was approved. Using a paper ballot, the ayes had it 77 votes to 23.

IV. Adjournment—Davison adjourned the meeting at 1:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis,  
Secretary

## **Addendum 1**

To: Arts & Sciences Faculty  
From: Lewis Duncan  
Re: Strategic Faculty Compensation System discussions  
Date: February 15, 2008

An important decision comes before the Arts & Sciences faculty next week regarding our movement toward a strategic faculty compensation system. The purpose of this plan is to provide a clear commitment from the administration and the Board of Trustees to substantively increase our overall faculty compensation, while also providing a process by which a portion of that increase will be based upon factors of performance and academic discipline.

As Rollins continues on its “good to great” ascension, faculty compensation must rise accordingly. We have established a group of peer and aspirant schools by which to benchmark ourselves, with an expectation that faculty compensation at Rollins within rank and discipline should exceed the median of our current peer schools, and rise at least to the median of our aspirant institutions. Such a significant adjustment to faculty compensation cannot be accomplished within a single year, nor does it represent a static target that can be achieved without a continuing multi-year commitment of resources by the College. To sustain such a commitment, and with the support of the Board of Trustees who ultimately must approve the College’s annual budget, Rollins is moving toward a three-year budgeting model. Over the past two years we also have initiated a much more participatory and transparent budgeting process through the Budget and Planning Committee, co-chaired by the Vice President for Business & Finance and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and including faculty representatives. The decision to make significantly raising faculty compensation an institutional highest priority came through the shared deliberative discussions of this group over the past year.

The following are key points shared with faculty and administrative representatives of the Budget and Planning Committee regarding the intent and commitment of the Board of Trustees for the development and implementation of a strategic faculty salary system:

- 1) the Board understands the primacy of the faculty in accomplishing the core mission of the institution and recognizes that this value must be reflected in a compensation system that appropriately recognizes and rewards faculty;
- 2) the Board is committed to ensuring that we can effectively recruit and retain talented faculty members across all disciplines to meet the growing educational needs of our students;
- 3) the Board is committed to a system of compensation based on merit and one’s contributions to the institutional mission (versus across-the-board increases) in order to reward excellent performance, but also recognizes that such a system

- must be guided by the faculty themselves in order to represent the unique history and culture of Rollins;
- 4) the Board recognizes that such a system must be established and implemented collaboratively among faculty and administrative representatives to ensure transparency, legitimacy, and accountability;
  - 5) the Board recognizes the importance of creating a strategic salary-tracking system to allow us to compare Rollins to peer and aspirant institutions while controlling for variables such as discipline, rank, years of service, etc. Such a system will allow us to identify, monitor, and address issues related to compression, inequity, and inversion over time to ensure that we are keeping pace with this important institutional commitment to academic excellence.

How we would choose to construct and implement such a strategic faculty compensation system has been left mostly to our own design. The prevailing wisdom favors retaining a traditional fixed percentage pool of funds that has been used historically across the faculty for annual inflationary adjustments, including a small percentage allocated to address any identified equity imbalances or promotion changes. This is essentially our current compensation model, graduated for faculty rank and years of service. Furthermore, we are moving toward introducing a separate and additional merit pool of funds to be assigned according to performance and discipline factors. At least initially, introduction of this performance-based supplement would also need to allow for meritorious service accruing over many past years but left unrewarded by our current salary system. I would envision a significant portion (perhaps on the order of half) of the first-year funds for this initiative to be used to address such residual equity issues.

The evaluative concept of merit remains an issue of considerable unease. As described before, it is our intention that any assessment system be designed and implemented through the faculty. We recognize that there are many forms of meritorious service in support of the College's mission, and that different individuals contribute to our collectively shared mission in many different ways and means. Any fair and equitable performance assessment system would necessarily acknowledge and encompass such diverse contributions. Personally, I also believe that an assessment system that involved rigorous merit review and peer/aspirant comparisons could not be efficiently administered as an annual process, but would be more effectively implemented on a three- or four-year cycle. However, such details remain to be worked out, principally through faculty discussion and design.

The budget for the '08-'09 fiscal year to be presented to the Board of Trustees next week includes a merit-based raise pool of approximately \$470K. This is in addition to the traditional "fixed percentage" adjustment pool that we have used in the past, and intend to have in our budgets in the future. If the faculty accept a strategic faculty compensation system, it is not necessary that we design and implement this system by this coming fall. Under this circumstance, we will request segregation of the merit pool funds identified to begin implementation of this system, and to have those funds held in a reserve until we are ready for their appropriate allocation.